

COVID-19 (Rep. Meng—Judiciary); “nay” on motion to recommit on H.R. 2694—Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (Rep. Nadler—Education and Labor); and “yea” on H.R. 2694—Pregnant Workers Fairness Act (Rep. Nadler—Education and Labor).

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 965, 116TH CONGRESS

Barragán (Beyer)	Langevin	Rooney (FL)
Blumenauer	(Lynch)	(Beyer)
(Beyer)	Lawrence	Roybal-Allard
Butterfield	(Kildee)	(Aguilar)
(Kildee)	Lawson (FL)	Rush
Chu, Judy	(Demings)	(Underwood)
(Takano)	Lieu, Ted (Beyer)	Serrano
Clay (Davids	(Ker)	Lipinski (Cooper)
(KS))	Lofgren (Jeffries)	(Jeffries)
Cohen (Beyer)	Lowenthal	Sewell (AL)
Davis, Danny K.	(Beyer)	(DelBene)
(Underwood)	Lowe (Tonko)	Sires (Pallone)
DeSaulnier	Meng (Clark	Trahan
(Matsui)	(MA))	(McGovern)
Frankel (Clark	Moore (Beyer)	Waters
(MA))	Napolitano	(Brownley
Grijalva (Raskin)	(Correa)	(CA))
Hastings	Payne	Watson Coleman
(Wasserman	(Wasserman	(Pallone)
Schultz)	Schultz)	Welch
Jayapal (Raskin)	Pingree (Clark	(McGovern)
Khanna (Gomez)	(MA))	Wilson (FL)
Kirkpatrick	Pocan (Raskin)	(Hayes)
(Gallego)	Porter (Wexton)	

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. SCALISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for next week.

Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the House majority leader.

HONORING RETIRING PARLIAMENTARIAN THOMAS J. WICKHAM, JR.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Before we begin the colloquy, let me make some remarks about someone who has made a real difference in this House.

Madam Speaker, every society that wants to be a successful society has to have rules. Thomas Jefferson, one of the great political thinkers of the centuries, observed that there had to be both comity and fairness if we were going to come together and have a democracy that was operational.

Dick Gephardt used to say that the legislative process was a substitute for armed confrontation, that the resolution of differences in a democracy needed to be done in a civil way, pursuant to rules.

Madam Speaker, we are losing, in a short period of time, a gentleman who has made a difference for this House, this Congress—House and Senate—has made a difference to the civility of this House, a gentleman who, by the way, is not responsible in any way for the lack of civility that, from time to time, breaks out in this House.

□ 1430

I refer, Madam Speaker, to our Parliamentarian, Tom Wickham. I have had the privilege of knowing him all of

his days in the House of Representatives. He has been here for a significant period of time and has served as our Parliamentarian for essentially four Congresses, 8 years.

He stands—or sits, at this point in time—a short, at least 6 feet, distance, with his mask on, which is a unique experience for him, from the Speaker's rostrum. He is there to ensure that we play by the rules. He is there to ensure us that we do not take advantage of one another, but that we resolve, in pursuit of the rules, the differences that we may have and do so in a way that, for centuries, essentially, have governed how we process in the legislative arena.

It is a nonpartisan role. Obviously, he served when there were Republican Speakers, and obviously, he is serving now with a Democratic Speaker. It is nonpartisan, but it is sometimes thankless, particularly when you have to make a ruling, particularly that the majority party does not like.

I must say that there is probably not a Member among us who hasn't at some point in time said either, “Gee, I am sorry Wickham made that ruling,” or, “I don't agree with Wickham.” Therefore, it is a tough job because we are all pretty powerful people. We all think we are pretty smart people, and we know this, that, and the other. So, you have to have the courage of your convictions as well as the intellectual reasoning to go behind your decision. Tom Wickham has had that every day he has served in this House.

It is hard to be a referee because the calls don't always go the way people want. One of the hallmarks of the Parliamentarian's Office, and Tom Wickham in particular, is they call them as they see them. No matter the effect of those rulings, they make the ruling that they believe is correct. You can disagree, but what you cannot disagree with is that the Parliamentarian's Office prides itself on calling them as they see them.

Now, it was difficult, I am sure, for every Parliamentarian, and the Parliamentarian's Office, to conduct this role. But they have done so in a manner, all the time I have been here, which I am in my 40th year, that has been a credit to the House of Representatives, a credit to our democracy, a credit to Thomas Jefferson's perception of trying to create rules and ways of doing things that credited democracy, that did not undermine it.

Tom was also the Deputy Parliamentarian and the Assistant Parliamentarian, so he has had a lot of experience. He has spent a quarter of a century working for this House.

I will miss him. We will miss him. This Congress will miss him.

He will be succeeded by somebody who has experience and depth and will, I know, in the tradition of all the Parliamentarians with whom I have worked over those 40 years, be fair and unflinching in calling it as he sees it.

We will miss Tom's good humor and kind nature. I know my staff will miss

working closely with him every day to ensure the smooth and proper running of the floor.

On behalf of Democrats, and I know Mr. SCALISE will speak on behalf of his party as well, I want to thank you, Tom, for your service, for your dedication to this institution, for the temperate way in which you dealt with all of us, even when we were not temperate. You were steady, thoughtful, fair.

Also, as I said, I want to congratulate Deputy Parliamentarian JASON SMITH, who will succeed Tom as Parliamentarian of the House. He will, as every Parliamentarian with whom I have served, be fair, be honest, and call them as he sees them. My staff and I look forward to working with him in his new role.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time.

Obviously, we will have an opportunity to continue, as we should, this tribute to Tom Wickham.

So, Tom, congratulations on what you have done to preserve the integrity of this institution.

We come here as Republicans, Democrats, as Americans first, but people who all have their own views. Even if you are Republican, we don't all think exactly the same way, as Democrats don't always think the same way. But we come here to achieve certain things, to make this a more perfect Union in the ways in which our districts—our 750,000, roughly, people elect us to come and be part of this democracy, the world's greatest democracy.

You come and work with other people. Sometimes, you battle with other people in the arena of legislative ideas. It is not physical confrontation, as the majority leader pointed out. But sometimes, you have to persuade. Sometimes, you have to fight for your beliefs.

But ultimately, if you are going to achieve the things you came here to do, you have to change legislation. It takes an act of Congress, as they say. When you do that, you have to follow the rules.

The Jefferson Manual that goes back to 1801 are the rules that govern this great House. If there is a bill on the floor and you wish to make a change to that bill, you want to offer an amendment to the bill, bring a motion to recommit on the bill, you have to work within the rules. Those rules are interpreted not by the majority, not by the minority, but by the Parliamentarian.

The job you have done for 25 years in the Parliamentarian's Office, but especially since 2011 as the House Parliamentarian, you don't always tell people what they want to hear, but you tell people what is the right way to do something according to the rules that we have established so that there is a fair process.

A lot of people don't see this back and forth. If the Parliamentarian rules against you, it is not a personal thing. In many cases, a Member will go to the

Parliamentarian, Republican or Democrat—I have done this myself—and said, “This is what I would like to achieve.”

Sometimes, they tell you that you can’t do it on that bill because there are germaneness issues. But sometimes, there is that gray area where if you are trying to do it this way, it won’t work, but if you try to do it another way, it actually would work. That is really the art of the ability of a Parliamentarian, to work with Members of Congress to help them achieve the things they are trying to do. We still have to go and get the votes, but at least allowing a Member that opportunity to go fight it out and make their case.

In many cases, that case wouldn’t be able to be made if the Parliamentarian wasn’t fair in offering that guidance to Members of Congress, whatever they are trying to achieve, whatever their background, whatever their district, to be fair and to at least give them that opportunity to come here on the House floor and fight that battle, hopefully right that wrong, and advance the things that they were elected to go do to make this a more perfect Union.

So thank you, Tom, for that fairness.

I know as Jason takes on this role in a few weeks, he will have a great legacy to build upon and to look toward somebody who did the job right and served this country in a very proud and respected way.

I know Heather is probably watching on C-SPAN. I am not sure how many other people are, but Heather, hopefully, is, your wife. She will have more time to work with you. I am not sure who the parliamentarian of your house is. I am the House Republican whip, but in my house, Jennifer is the one who plays that role.

But in your house, hopefully, Heather sees you more, because you are here when we are here, and sometimes those are late hours, and sometimes those are long weekends.

We appreciate the sacrifices you have made. Hopefully, in this next role in your life, you will be able to enjoy more time with your wife, Heather, and your family.

We truly do thank you for playing this part of your role in history and adding to what is great about this great democracy.

Do you mind standing up so everybody in the Chamber here can see you and pay the proper tribute?

Madam Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

If I might wryly observe, Madam Speaker, that I have not seen the Parliamentarian pass you a note to instruct the gentleman to address the Chair.

Tom, I am going to address you.

Mr. SCALISE. As I was addressing it to the Speaker, of course.

Mr. HOYER. Tom Wickham, for those who are watching, is a wonderful example of the extraordinary patriotism,

loyalty, and talent that has contributed to this House’s operation by all of our staff. He is one of the best, but we have the best.

Tom, I know you treated all the staff, certainly on my staff—and I know all the staff—with great respect because you knew how important they were. We all know how important you have been to the operations of this House.

I don’t know what you will be doing. But assuming that you, at this young age of yours—I told you that you were way too young for us to let you go, but you are going—you will be doing other things, and you will bring great value to whatever enterprise you pursue.

We have been blessed for a quarter of a century with your service, and we thank you for that service. Godspeed.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time.

Madam Speaker, we all appreciate Tom’s service to our country and especially to this Chamber.

Now, if I may inquire of the majority leader the schedule for next week, and I would yield.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for legislative business. No votes are expected in the House on Monday.

On Tuesday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 11 a.m. for legislative business.

I would remind Members that Monday is expected to be a travel day following the holiday. So, Monday we will have business on the floor, but we will have no votes on the floor.

On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 11 a.m. for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business.

We will consider several bills, Madam Speaker, under suspension of the rules, a large number of suspension bills, in fact. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

The House will consider, as well, next week a continuing resolution for fiscal year 2021.

Madam Speaker, the House has passed 10 of its appropriations bills of the 12 appropriations bills we have.

Sadly, the Senate has not passed a single bill out of committee, has not voted on a single appropriations bill in its committee. As a result, clearly, we will not be able to conclude the appropriations process, and we will have to have a CR to make sure that government stays serving the American people.

Hopefully, we can reach a bipartisan agreement, and there will not be a controversial continuing resolution. I know Democrats and Republicans and the administration are working toward that end.

I expect and hope a bill to be filed tomorrow. That is our hope. But we do expect to consider that bill next week.

The CR, as I said, is necessary to avert a shutdown that would only fur-

ther damage our economy and undermine our efforts on COVID-19.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 4447, the Clean Economy Jobs and Innovation Act. This bill, Madam Speaker, is a package of legislation reported out of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the Science, Space, and Technology Committee to invest in energy innovation and clean energy development.

In addition, the House may consider H.R. 6270, the Uyghur Forced Labor Disclosure Act, and H.R. 6210, the Uyghur Forced Labor Prevention Act.

Members are advised that additional legislative items are possible.

I yield back to my friend, the Republican whip.

□ 1445

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman and appreciate the timeline, especially the comments about the negotiations that have been going on in a very constructive way regarding a continuing resolution. They have definitely been in good faith with Republicans and Democrats as well as with the White House. It is encouraging to hear that, potentially, tomorrow that could be filed and we fully expect to be ready to take that up next week if that does, in fact, happen.

I know the differences that we have been talking about in the last few days are minor in consideration of all of the factors that are included in a continuing resolution. So I think, as people watch some of the bigger fights that are real between the two sides, to see that on something as important as properly and responsibly funding the government that we are making very good progress on at least a short-term mechanism that would stave off any kind of shutdown between now and September 30, I appreciate the work that has been done by the majority with the minority and with the White House and Senate to get to that point. Hopefully, we do get that legislation filed and are able to take it up next week.

Unless the gentleman had anything else on that, there was another legislative issue I wanted to bring up.

As we both know, there are conversations going on regarding a potential next relief package. We don’t know if there will be an agreement reached. These negotiations have been going on for weeks and weeks since the CARES Act, the multiple pieces of legislation that we filed both before and after that we have come to an agreement on, things like the Paycheck Protection Program that both sides worked very hard on, very successfully on.

Reports have come out to show over 50 million Americans’ jobs were saved by the work we did as a Congress working together to save millions of small businesses and over 50 million jobs as we are struggling through this pandemic.

One of the things I would like to ask the gentleman to take a look at is that

we may get an agreement, but we may not on a bigger relief package, and we see multiple bills that are out there. The Senate has been trying to advance something. The House has had a position. Some House Democrats yesterday filed a separate bill with some other House Republicans to try to have a third way, and the White House has been talking about a different option. In the meantime, we clearly don't have an agreement yet on that.

I would ask if the gentleman would look at H.R. 8265. This is a bill by Representative CHABOT of Ohio. He is the lead Republican on the House Small Business Committee. This is a bill that would specifically target those small businesses that were part of the Paycheck Protection Program. This is not a new idea. This is taking the existing framework of a bill that we, both sides, came together to pass, a very successful bill.

As the gentleman knows, the Paycheck Protection Program still has over \$130 billion remaining in its account, money that wasn't spent. We were able to help every business that asked. Every business that was eligible was able to go to their local bank, didn't have to go to an SBA lender.

Again, I want to thank our small community banks that played such an important role. We would not have been able to help all those small businesses stay afloat if our local community banks didn't participate in helping the customers that they usually see on a daily basis who are struggling.

But as that money is sitting in that account, the program has expired, so the money can no longer be spent. We have appropriated this money. It is not new money and it is not a new program. But what Representative CHABOT's bill does is it would allow those small businesses that have shown a loss—we know there are some businesses doing better today than they were before COVID; there are some that are doing dramatically worse after COVID.

This would specifically be limited to those businesses that have experienced at least a 25 percent loss or more, that they would be able to go for a second round of Paycheck Protection loans, using existing money, not new money, the money that is locked in an account that can no longer be spent.

So maybe we do get an agreement between now and then on a larger package, but if we don't, at a minimum, I would just ask the gentleman—I would think this would be something that could pass on the suspension calendar to at least help small businesses using a program we already agree upon, that we already know has been successful. It saved small businesses in every single district of this country. It is not a Republican or Democrat plan. It has been a plan that truly has been a lifeline for any of our small businesses. And, again, over 50 million jobs have been saved.

I would just ask the gentleman if he would take a look at that, if we don't

get an agreement, to potentially bring something like that to the floor—that could be a suspension-type bill to pass—and, at least while we are negotiating things that may or may not happen, help those businesses that we know need help.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Of course, the Paycheck Protection Program was a very, very important program. I was pleased that the committees came up with that program and we had bipartisan support for that program.

I will tell the gentleman that that is an important effort for us to take, but I would also say it is very important for us to act on behalf of millions of people who still do not have a job or are on unemployment and need the supplemental unemployment that they were receiving to survive and keep their families going.

We have millions of people who are suffering from food shortages, the inability to keep their family fed. We need to pass, we believe, the supplemental nutrition program.

We need to make sure that States, in my view, have the ability to function. They are hemorrhaging revenues because of COVID-19, because of the decrease in the economy. States, cities, municipalities, counties are suffering, and many other aspects, including testing, which is one of the critical components of us confronting COVID-19.

So while I agree with the gentleman that the program that he talks about—of course, we created that program and we passed it in a bipartisan fashion, and it was very bipartisan in the Senate. I know Mr. CARDIN and Mr. RUBIO were both involved in that. It was very important to pass that.

But I will tell the gentleman that I was pleased that the President indicated that we need to invest very significant sums, which he then said would come back to the U.S. or help the U.S. economy. I think that was a positive step forward.

I would also observe, as the gentleman observed, that Speaker PELOSI and Secretary Mnuchin reached four major deals, compromises—four. One was, we thought, very big at the time, \$8.3 billion, which now looks somewhat small. But we reached four of those. We brought them to the House floor, the Senate floor, and they passed overwhelmingly in bipartisan votes.

Secretary Mnuchin and the Speaker have been discussing trying to get to, for 4 months now—now, Mr. MEADOWS is also in the room. Mr. MEADOWS and I have a very positive relationship, but my observation has been, through the years, Mr. MEADOWS is more about stopping deals than making deals.

But I agree with the gentleman, we need to act. I am hopeful that the administration and the Senate and the House will reach agreement ASAP, not only on the PPP, which I agree with the gentleman on, not only on the

PPP, but all the other programs that I mentioned and many more that are in the HEROES bill.

The Speaker has indicated we are certainly prepared to negotiate what the expenditure is, and she has indicated a willingness to come down very, very substantially to try to reach an agreement, which is what compromise is all about. That hasn't happened yet, but I am hopeful that it will happen in the near term, because I agree with the gentleman, we need to act. I am urging the administration and all of us to come to an agreement.

Unfortunately, in the Senate, their efforts have not been successful in passing a bill. So we have no alternative bill beyond the HEROES bill that passed, as I said, 4 months ago, so we have nothing to conference because there is no Senate bill.

In fact, Mr. MCCONNELL went from a trillion down to a half a trillion, which almost every economist, either at a trillion or half a trillion, says is not sufficient for health reasons and economic reasons and family reasons to confront the enormity of the challenge that still confronts us as a result of COVID-19.

So I thank the gentleman for mentioning Mr. CHABOT's legislation. He is right, of course, there is \$130 billion in the pot. I think we ought to purpose that to either a continuation of PPP or a continuation of PPP and other things. But I think we ought to do it, and what we are trying to do is a comprehensive package that deals with all the challenges confronting American families, particularly the unemployment insurance.

As of July 31, as the gentleman knows, the supplemental payment lapsed. To some degree, the President has tried to put additional sums in there. Some States are pursuing it and some States have effected it.

But I hope that the bottom line is, in the next week, in the near term, and I think the President's statement was helpful, and I hope, frankly, the Senators take that to heart, that we need to invest much more than they suggested if we are going to meet the scope of the problem that exists.

I thank the gentleman bringing to the House's attention that particular bill, and certainly it will be under consideration as well, I think, by those who are negotiating, mainly Secretary Mnuchin and Speaker PELOSI. Mr. MCCONNELL has chosen not to participate in those discussions, as you know. Mr. SCHUMER does, and I think Mr. MCCARTHY does—I am not sure all the time, but I am sure he does as well.

We want to get an agreement. We want to do what we have done four times: reached an agreement, passed it overwhelmingly in both Houses for the people, because the people are hurting and we need to act and meet that challenge of their hurt and their need to support themselves, their families, and, as you point out, their businesses.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

As we look at the various topics that the gentleman from Maryland brought up on the negotiations, if you looked at the Senate bill—and, clearly, there are multiple bills out there—ultimately, it is going to take a bipartisan bill working with the administration. Mr. MEADOWS has been here many times working, trying to meet, sometimes not being able to get meetings with some leaders.

But at the same time, if you look at the Senate bill, they did include some enhanced unemployment. They included more money for small businesses, for families, for testing. They had \$16 billion for testing, \$31 billion for vaccine, which I know—I want to bring that up. They had \$20 billion for farmers, \$15 billion for childcare.

They did have liability protection, which continues to be a very big issue many small businesses bring up. They want to make sure that, if they open safely, they are not going to be shut down by frivolous lawsuits. That is something that there has been a lot of negotiation about as well.

But, ultimately, when you look at those differences, we will hopefully get that resolved. In the meantime, if that can't get broken, at a minimum, if we can look at some of the money that is unspent because, in addition to the PPP, I think the gentleman knows, we also put about \$150 billion in the CARES Act toward our States to help all of our States, a formula that allowed States and, in some cases, local governments get money to help themselves through these tough times.

There is not one State that has spent all that money. And I know some people want to talk about how much more money to give, but if they haven't spent the money they have already gotten, maybe we can look there as another way to help push more relief, including with schools.

If a school wants to reopen safely—and I would encourage all schools, the protocols have been out there. The Centers for Disease Control have put out very good, responsible safety protocols for safely reopening schools, and it varies, depending on the kind of region you are in. If you have a spike, there is a way to handle that. If you are in an area that has not seen a prevalence of COVID, then there is a different way to handle it. But in every case, there is a way to safely reopen schools. The American Academy of Pediatrics has laid that out as well. It means following the safety guidelines, but it can be done and needs to be done.

Unfortunately, in every case it is not being done, but it is not for lack of money. Any school system that needs more assistance, whether it is masks or screens for the teachers or whatever else they might need, sanitizer, the funds that we sent to the States, again, none of which have spent all of that money, can be used to help to safely reopen schools as well.

So those are all conversations we will hopefully have.

I do want to then talk about where we are with a vaccine, because we have been seeing a lot more reports on the progress, the tremendous progress that has been made within the medical community. And we know from the very beginning of this disease that our frontline healthcare workers have been some of the heroes, probably the biggest heroes of all of this, those hospital workers, the nurses, the doctors, but also those people working in the labs.

□ 1500

Almost instantly after China lied to us about the origination of the disease, lied to us about even whether or not the disease could be spread from person to person they corrupted the WHO. But ultimately as we started to find out what was coming out of Wuhan, I don't know, even the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House majority had a hearing titled: "The Wuhan Coronavirus." So clearly, we know where this started. It has been discussed.

But at the same time, we have been working feverishly to find a cure, to find a vaccine. We have seen therapies emerge at a rapid pace. President Trump implemented Operation Warp Speed, which was a way to get red tape out of the way. Nobody is cutting corners on safety, but ultimately what we are all doing is focusing all the energy and the weight of this Federal Government behind finding a cure and a vaccine, and what we are seeing now is remarkable success in progress.

Here are some of the companies that right now are in phase 3 of testing on an actual vaccine for COVID-19. These are all very respected companies, not only in America, but worldwide, globally respected.

I am concerned by some of the comments we are starting to see by some people trying to undermine the public's confidence in a vaccine if it were to be approved by the FDA. And let's keep in mind, the FDA would have to approve any vaccine. You have to get approved by the FDA to go to phase 2. You have to get approved to go to phase 3, and then ultimately after testing on tens of thousands of people at a pace we have never seen before—with money, by the way, that we helped pass, and again, the gentleman and I both were part of those coalitions, Republican and Democrat, working to put money in place for that testing, for the work that is being done by these great companies to start now making the vaccine vials, a hundred million vials possibly that could be made before the drug is approved if, in fact, it then gets that approval, so that you don't have to wait to start mass producing after the approval.

If the FDA does approve any or all of these drugs as a vaccine that would actually prevent COVID-19, I hope we would both encourage people, if they wanted to, to then go and get that vaccine. And this is, hopefully, not going to be a debate within the country. Hopefully, it is going to be a recogni-

tion that America has the best scientific minds in the world. We have the most respected drug companies in the world, and they are working feverishly, not cutting a single corner on safety.

These would have to be safe and effective drugs for the FDA to approve them, but if any one or all of them get approved, then I would hope we would encourage people to go and protect their families, if that is what they want to do. And I know a lot of people that would want to do it. I have heard from some people, as I am sure the gentleman has, that they may want to wait a little while. But I also know that people want to be safe and secure in their homes. They want to have a confidence level that they are not going to be at risk of dying from COVID. And ultimately a vaccine and a therapy are the final answer that gets us over the hump, that gets us to where we can fully start reopening.

We are seeing many States at advanced levels of opening their economy, but we also know that we are not where we need to be, and a vaccine is probably going to be that biggest determining point that helps people reopen in a much more effective way. I hope we can at least agree that if that approval comes by the FDA that it is something we can all embrace and encourage people to pursue, if that is what they feel is best for their family.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, the whip mentioned undermining confidence. I will tell the whip with all due respect; nobody has undermined confidence in the healthcare system more than the President of the United States. No one has diverted more attention from the experts; no one has denigrated the experts, which undermines confidence in their advice and counsel, than the President of the United States. And no one in the health community said that the coronavirus was a hoax.

We have just seen that Mr. Woodward heard in late January that the President thought this was a very serious matter. And then, frankly, he conveyed to the American people, don't worry about it, it is going to go away. In a few days, a few weeks, it is going to go away.

No one has undermined the confidence of the American people in the CDC or the FDA or the NIH more than the President of the United States. He said they are wrong.

And I say that because confidence needs to be built by leadership. And if the vaccine can come out next month, hooray, if it can be done consistent with what the medical experts and the pharmaceutical experts tell us can give the American people confidence.

But I will tell my friend Mr. Caputo substantially undermined confidence because he wanted to tell the experts what to say apparently consistent with what the administration's policy was as opposed to what the scientific evidence was.

And so when you mention confidence, some people were trying to undermine confidence; we have had six, seven, eight months of undermining confidence.

And it is a shame. Because the gentleman is absolutely right. People are going to need confidence. And they are going to have to take the vaccine because that is the only way this economy is going to get back to where it needs to be. People having confidence in the safety for themselves, their husband, their wife, their children to be about the business of America and their own personal business.

So I would hope that the President would leave it to the experts, not to his judgment, to the experts as to when a vaccine is ready to deliver to the public. And then I think all of us ought to have that confidence to—I certainly am going to get the vaccine when the medical experts tell me this is safe to take, and I am going to urge my family to do the same. And I am sure you have just indicated you would do the same. I think we will, hopefully, do that.

But the instilling of confidence, I would tell my friend, starts at the top and with all of us, as well, because people respect us in some respects sometimes, and they think we have knowledge that they may not have, and therefore, they want to have confidence that, yes, this is good; no, it is not, don't do it.

So I would simply say to my friend, I hope that we get a vaccine. I hope we get it as soon as possible. And I hope that the election has nothing to do with the vaccine. I hope the decision has everything to do with science and medicine. And I think all Americans hope that, as well.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I would tell the gentleman it is not hope that you have to have. This is all about science.

Name one of these companies that would put their name on a drug that would be injected into American people based on politics or based on a timeline that would have an impact on an election? Not one of these companies would do it. I would challenge anyone to name a company that would do that, because they wouldn't do that. So it is not a hope.

If the FDA approves one of these drugs or all of these drugs, it is because they work, they save lives. And we can't have an undermined confidence that they would save lives—because a vaccine is not something that a President or a candidate for President sits in a lab and figures out. It is a very serious process that the FDA, who is the most respected agency in the world for drug approval, has to sign off on every step of the way.

There are three phases. These are the companies that made it all the way through. There are other companies that are in earlier stages and may actually get to an FDA-approved vaccine, as well, and they are all very well respected, too, but these are the only

companies. There is no mystery company. These are the companies that are in competition, not with themselves, but they are trying to save lives. And from everything we are hearing, the results are tremendously successful. We should be applauding that.

Operation Warp Speed has gotten us to this point, and while the President might not get credit—and I think it is an important point, as the gentleman talks about instilling confidence, where the President is on science. I have been in many of those meetings with Dr. Fauci, with Dr. Birx, with the whole team of the whole coronavirus task force.

Mr. HOYER. How about Dr. Redfield?

Mr. SCALISE. He has been in some of those meetings, too. And as the gentleman knows, not all doctors agree.

Mr. HOYER. Did you see what happened in the last 48 hours?

Mr. SCALISE. There are some doctors who will say this is the way to do it, and there are some doctors who say that is the way to do it. You get 10 attorneys in a room; you might get 10 opinions. The saying “go get a second opinion,” that is because maybe not all doctors agree.

But when you are President of the United States you don't have the luxury of waiting for every doctor to be in agreement. If there is an inflection point on a decision, and some doctors are over here, and some doctors are over there, guess what, it is the President who has to make that final call, not because he has ignored science, but because he has looked to the science, and ultimately, he has to make that decision.

Dr. Fauci himself was in a committee hearing by the Select Subcommittee that the majority whip, Mr. CLYBURN, chairs. I am the lead Republican on that committee. We had Dr. Fauci in our committee. I asked him specifically, I went down the line on major decisions that had to be made by this President and whether or not science was used or not and whether or not it worked. I started, by the way, with the decision of whether or not to stop flights from China when we found out after China lied that they, in fact, did have this disease spreading widely in China, and President Trump made that decision to stop flights from China.

I know the Democrat nominee for President was against that decision, but President Trump worked with the experts. Dr. Fauci was part of that.

I asked him, I said, Was that the right decision by President Trump?

He said, Yes, it was.

I said, Did that decision save American lives?

He said, Yes, it I did.

And we went down the line on decision after decision, and they were all science-based. At no point was the President trying to undermine science.

In fact, some people were trying to suggest that Dr. Fauci was being sidelined, and yet, he was at the hearing, under oath, speaking on behalf of his

role in the administration, and he said he has never been sidelined. He was actually asked that question, Have you been sidelined? He said, “no” under oath.

Now, is he always in agreement with the other doctors in the room? No, he is not. Does that mean he is wrong? No. But maybe he is. But, again, doctors can disagree because that is what science is. It is not two plus two equals four every time because you are dealing with some very complicated issues of a disease we knew nothing about less than a year ago.

Fortunately, with Operation Warp Speed, President Trump put together the best scientists, not just in America, but I would argue in the world, to figure out how to solve this, how to come up with things like hydroxychloroquine, which some people might say doesn't work. I have talked to many doctors who use it successfully to save lives even today. That should be the doctor's decision. Some people want government to control all those decisions. I would rather the doctor being the one to work with his patient.

You look at the other drugs that are out there today, but again, now we talk about a vaccine, there is not one company on this list—these are the only companies right now in phase 3. And if any of them are approved by the FDA, I hope nobody would question the integrity of that drug.

Do you think any of these companies would put their name on a drug that they don't stand behind as a safe and effective vaccine for this disease? And that is really the point.

It is all about science here. It is all about science and some people are trying to undermine that. And we need to get away from that because that will cost lives. If somebody is reluctant to take one of these drugs because they heard somebody that said, well, don't trust it if it comes from this President or that candidate, that is a dangerous game because lives would be lost if people didn't take that vaccine because they didn't have that confidence. We all need to have that confidence. We all work with science.

We have all had doctors who told us one thing, and maybe you wanted to go get that second opinion, but at the end of the day, you have got to make that choice, and you make it based on all the science that is available, and not all the time do all the scientists agree. In fact, many times on the complicated issues you get different opinions from different scientists. This President has worked with some of the best in the world.

And according to Dr. Fauci himself, by and large, the President has followed even Dr. Fauci's advice and has made the right decisions up and down the line based on science. And most importantly, President Trump's decision following the science has saved American lives, starting with that very first decision, which Joe Biden himself was

against. How many American lives would have been lost if we didn't ban the flights from China; if we didn't ban the flights from Europe, when it was breaking out in Europe; if we didn't do 15 days to stop the spread, which President Trump did on the advice of his scientist? After that they said we need to go another 30 days. President Trump did that, too. Every one of those decisions was based on science. Every one of those decisions saved American lives.

□ 1515

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

This President doesn't take responsibility for anything other than good things. If anything bad happens, this President does not take responsibility. He points to somebody else.

What I interrupted the gentleman on was he says, "the scientists." Redfield is a scientist. He is a medical doctor. He is the head of the CDC. He made a comment, his best judgment as to when vaccines were going to be available, widely available.

The President contradicted him on both points he made just a few days ago, as he has done with Fauci, as he has done with Hahn, as he has done with others.

My confidence in those three companies is that they will come to the referee and will say: "Is this ready to go?" The referee, in this case the FDA, that the gentleman says is so respected has that responsibility.

What I don't have confidence in, what I think so many of the American people don't have confidence in, is they will get a call from the White House that says: "This is the judgment you are going to make."

We have seen, over and over and over again, decisions modified because of White House direction. In fact, Caputo was there for exactly that reason at HHS, not CDC, but overseeing CDC.

I tell my friend, Madam Speaker, yes, we need to have confidence, but we need to be truthful with them. We need to tell them the truth. We need to take direction from the experts, not substitute our judgment.

The gentleman talks about hydroxychloroquine. Obviously, Fauci didn't think that was a great recommendation to make. That was for doctors to make, but the President made it. In fact, most of the doctors thought that was not a good recommendation.

Certainly, Clorox was even less than that, I say as an aside. Maybe it was tongue in cheek, but unfortunately, when the President speaks, people don't necessarily think it is tongue in cheek, and it becomes dangerous.

I will say to my friend, hopefully, that this vaccine issue will be resolved by the experts and give confidence to the American people that they can, in fact, rely on the experts and their doctor to take the vaccine because, hopefully, it will be in a position where, in

fact, it will give the confidence and the result that is promised.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I would just remind the gentleman, with all due respect to Dr. Redfield, he is not the head of the FDA.

The FDA is the agency that approves drugs, and in fact, the FDA is the agency working every day with these companies. There is a very strict protocol for going through phases of testing.

Now, one thing that is important to point out on the testing, because, again, some people wonder because Operation Warp Speed has gotten us to a point quicker, maybe in the history of the world, at finding a vaccine for a disease we knew nothing about 8 months ago, but the reason they are doing it is not because they are cutting corners. No one in science that I have heard has suggested that they are cutting corners because they are not. They have strict protocols.

What they are doing, number one, the President put real money in place behind making sure that each of these drug companies has direct communication with the FDA every step of the way so they know if tests need to be run on more people or different demographic groups, as is done with other drugs, they can do it quickly. They have a wide range of people willing to be tested.

To the tribute of all Americans, over 300,000 Americans have signed up for these tests. This isn't being tested on just a few people. Sometimes, a drug takes years and years to get to market for a lot of reasons. One is red tape.

President Trump has done a great job of getting the red tape out of the way to let the scientists actually do their job in real time. Something could sit on somebody's desk for months, in many cases, delaying lifesaving drugs. We have gotten that red tape out of the way.

Frankly, we ought to look at working together as Republicans and Democrats at making that the norm, not the exception, to actually be able to get red tape out of the way to help save lives.

But as they are doing it, they are testing it on more people than is normally the case. Sometimes, you might only have a few thousand people who are willing or in a position to be tested. Today, you have hundreds of thousands of people who are being tested.

If they make it through each step, it is not based on who is in the White House. It is based on what the doctors at the FDA, working with the smart people in these drug companies, have come up with based on the test results. If they test people and there are problems, it doesn't even make it to phase 2.

These are all in phase 3. They are all showing tremendous promise, but if one of them makes it through or if all of them make it through, it is not because somebody rushed it. It is because the doctors and the scientists said it works. Not one of these companies

would put their name on that vaccine, not one of them.

Again, I would challenge anybody, Madam Speaker, if they think any of these companies would cut a corner, please let us know right now because that is not the case. That narrative shouldn't be out there because that narrative would be a false narrative and would cost American lives. If that narrative were to get out, then there might be people who wouldn't take the vaccine who otherwise would and should, where it could save their life, because this will save American lives.

And it is through American ingenuity. We ought to be proud of this.

We should put the politics aside and say thank God America is the leader in healthcare to the point where we have great American companies partnering, in this case, with a German company here in America, testing at a level we have never seen before on more people because we took the priority, through Operation Warp Speed, to put all the focus of these great agencies on finding a cure for COVID-19.

We are on the brink of doing it. It may not happen if the science doesn't match. But if the science does say these work, we all ought to applaud that and encourage people to explore, in a conversation with their doctor, whether or not they should take it.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I am not going to prolong this. The only thing I would say is, under the gentleman's theory, Madam Speaker, we wouldn't need the FDA because, clearly, these companies would not do anything just because of profit. And I don't allege that they would do that.

But we have an FDA because we need a referee to look at it without thinking of the consequences of a yes or no answer but a scientific answer. That is the only observation I would make.

I get it. I get that the companies are reputable companies.

I support them. They do great work. But we have an FDA because we need somebody who is an independent arbiter, not just because no company would do this. Because if no company would do it, we wouldn't need the FDA.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I never suggested that. In fact, I said at the outset that these companies are in direct communication with the FDA on a regular basis. That is what Operation Warp Speed is.

In the old way of doing things, these companies would have submitted their data and would have waited months while some faceless bureaucrat let it sit on a desk and nothing happened.

Instead, what the President did was said there will be direct contacts where they can communicate with the FDA. They are not the enemy.

These companies aren't the enemy. The FDA is not the enemy. But it shouldn't be viewed as you are on one side and you are on the other side.

They are both working together because they are both part of the smartest scientific community in the world.

They work together because the FDA wants to get it right and these companies want to get it right.

We saw one of them just a few days ago. They had a pause, which is the protocol. That is the safety protocol because there was a question in the testing, and they addressed it. I am sure there were many. I don't know directly, but I am sure there were many conversations with the FDA.

But then they started up again, which means there wasn't a problem. But it meant they followed the protocols, which say, if you see something that you need to go review, you hold off, and then you go check that out. That is what one of these did, and now they are back on track.

The others continue to go through, all of them, working with the FDA. That is really what this is about. It is about a partnership because the FDA has to sign off.

I am sure the gentleman would agree. You want to make sure you have multiple people looking at it. You don't just want the company that is making the drug looking at it. You want the regulator looking at it as well because, ultimately, they have to sign off on it.

They are not doing it blindly. No one suggests that. But they are doing it with a much sharper focus. It is the top priority, I think we would all agree. This needs to be the priority to get our country back on track, and it has to be done right. But it is not going to get signed off if it is not right. So, it is a partnership, and it is working incredibly well.

Again, this new partnership ought to be the model in the future. It shouldn't be the exception just because of COVID. It is working incredibly well.

We worked together to pass the 21st Century Cures Act, which ultimately will find a cure for cancer, for Alzheimer's, for ALS, for other diseases. It is because we put a sharper focus over at the National Institutes of Health, and we put additional resources over at the National Institutes of Health.

That priority, what we are learning from this, ought to be replicated to help find a cure for some of those other diseases so that maybe we can find even more cures for people who are living today, not just for somebody 30 years from now, but for somebody struggling today with one of those terrible diseases.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I have nothing left to say.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I know we will continue this conversation. Hopefully, the bill gets filed tomorrow, and we can resolve more of these issues next week. I look forward to seeing the gentleman and working with him on all of these.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING COMMISSIONER BILLIE DEAN

(Mrs. DEMINGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. DEMINGS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the life of Commissioner Billie Dean from the city of Apopka.

Mr. Dean was a guiding light for Apopka.

From bravery in Korea, to the classrooms and commission, to the forefront of racial integration in the South, Commissioner Dean was a champion for his community.

He was a local hero for his work to revitalize South Apopka and to fight for justice. As a teacher and a commissioner, he made the future of Apopka his ultimate cause.

There is no higher praise for a public servant than the love of his community. Apopka loved him, and he loved Apopka.

Madam Speaker, we are grateful for a life well lived.

AMERICANS ARE WAITING

(Mr. HILL of Arkansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Madam Speaker, why were we brought back to Washington, D.C., this week?

Was it to provide much-needed relief and assistance to American families and small businesses because of the pandemic? No.

Instead, we continue to spend time on another set of mostly partisan messaging bills with little or no input from Republicans. My Democratic colleagues rely on grandstanding and talk more about the bills they have passed than the bills, Madam Speaker, they have actually gotten signed into law.

It is time for Democrats to get serious and stop trying to score political points and come back to the negotiating table. Let's serve the American people by actually getting much-needed bipartisan legislation signed into law to fight this virus and get our economy back.

We have already proven how much good we can accomplish for American families and the American people when we work together.

RECOGNIZING HOPE LEE ON HIS 100TH BIRTHDAY

(Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Hope Lee, a revered constituent of New York's 14th Congressional District who is celebrating his 100th birthday this year and has served so valiantly for our country.

During World War II, Mr. Lee received a Bronze Star Medal, two Purple

Hearts, and a Combat Infantry Badge for his service to the country during World War II.

Mr. Lee, in fact, was supposed to go to Washington, D.C., this year to get his Congressional Gold Medal of Honor this May, but it was postponed due to the pandemic.

I think it is incredibly important to honor his work and his service here on the House floor.

He is extraordinarily proud of his service in the U.S. military and hangs his American flag outside his house for every U.S. holiday.

In fact, he and his wife, Rose Lee, have been happily married for 76 years, and Mr. Lee still does the cooking for himself and his wife.

Madam Speaker, I ask our colleagues to join me in recognizing Mr. Hope Lee.

Thank you for your service, and happy birthday, Mr. Lee.

□ 1530

SUICIDE PREVENTION AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. WALTZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WALTZ. Madam Speaker, as a combat veteran, I think a lot about my past experiences in battle and personally have dealt with my own struggles, from PTS to survivor's guilt.

But this year, we are in a collective battle, and the front lines look very different. We are fighting against an invisible enemy, against COVID-19, and we are forced to distance ourselves and to change our entire way of life. This isolation is causing anxiety, depression, and sometimes takes us to even darker places, even with suicidal thoughts.

September is Suicide Prevention Awareness Month, and I am teaming with a veterans group, Mission Roll Call, to raise awareness about suicide prevention, especially the 22 veterans per day we are currently losing.

In combat, we are constantly checking on our brothers and sisters to our left and our right, and we have to do the same back here at home. So I say to all veterans out there: Reach out. Ask your buddy how they are doing. Share a memory. Let them know that you are thinking about them and you have their back.

Together, we are stronger. Together, we can win this fight.

NATIONAL RECOVERY MONTH

(Ms. DEAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DEAN. Madam Speaker, recovery is challenging and isolating even during normal days, and this pandemic has only made it more difficult for those who suffer from addiction and substance use disorder. That is why National Recovery Month, this month,